

zero—illegal immigration. If immigrants who have been living in our country illegally want to become tax-paying American citizens, they need to pass a background check, pay extra taxes, work towards citizenship, learn English, register.

We need immigration reform that is both principled and pragmatic. We in this country have the right to decide who lives in our country and who doesn't, but we haven't been exercising that right. We've been allowing millions of people to live here without knowing who they are or what they are doing. Yet we continue to refuse to take action, and we do so at our own peril.

Yes, we should hear very clearly from Arizona and from other States that they are demanding action of the Federal Government. There is no good solution for a county or a State. I sympathize with our cities, our counties, and our States which are dealing with the failure of a Federal policy to protect our borders—Federal policies that undermine the rule of law and our national sovereignty, but it falls to the United States Congress to act to fix our broken immigration laws. People should not be able to cross the borders or to overstay their visas without permission, and businesses should not be able to exploit cheap labor off the books, undermining jobs for American citizens.

We in Congress have a unique opportunity now to take action. The American people are tired of excuses. They are tired of demagoguery. They want a solution that works and that ensures that we will have zero illegal immigrants in a year and in 10 years and in 20 years rather than seeing an increase from 10 or 12 million to 20 million or to 25 million or to 30 million.

What does "national sovereignty" mean if you don't even know who is within your borders or what they're doing or whether they're criminals? Why are we putting over 300,000 of them up at expensive hotels at over \$100 a day at taxpayer expense? Is that part of the solution?

□ 2015

It doesn't sound like part of the solution that the people of Arizona want. It doesn't sound like part of the solution that the American people want. Obey our laws, learn English, pay taxes, and welcome to America. We need to replace a broken system with one that works.

I call upon my colleagues in this Chamber and in the United States Senate on both sides of the aisle to stop playing political games with an issue that the American people are crying out for a solution on and to act and bring forward a real solution along the lines of the proposal that was introduced in the Senate today, along the lines of the House comprehensive immigration reform bill to demand that Congress move towards fixing this problem, restoring security to our bor-

ders, sovereignty to our Nation, preventing the undermining of the rule of law that this Nation was built upon, and strengthening our economy and providing jobs for American families.

Madam Speaker, I hope that my colleagues join me in moving forward immediately on comprehensive immigration reform to fix our broken laws and replace it with a system that works and is enforced.

#### ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it's my privilege and honor to be recognized by you to address the floor tonight.

I am standing here trying to decide whether I want to support or rebut the statements from the gentleman from Colorado. I support a good number of the statements that he has made, and I may well try to rebut some of the other statements that he has made.

But the statement "replace a broken system with one that works," it's an interesting comment. I think it's clear that our immigration system is not working. Well, let me say that the system doesn't work, but I am not certain that the laws are incorrect. And that's the point that I would make is that I roll back to 1986 when Ronald Reagan was straight-up honest and failed me when he signed the amnesty bill of 1986. And the intent was that about a million people would be granted a path to citizenship and that would be it, it would be the end, and there would never be another immigration bill ever as long as any of us lived, and we would preserve the rule of law, and we'd learn to respect the rule of law, but we would allow for the million or so that were here illegally to have their path to citizenship in order to put this away, package it up, and be able to move on.

Well, it wasn't 1 million. It was closer to 3 million people, and there was fraud and there was corruption and there were counterfeit documents that were used that was part of that tripling. We might not have counted it right. It might have been more than a million. It might have been 1½ million. It was unlikely to be 2 million. But it turned out to be 3 million because people were gaming the system.

In my particular office, I took applications in and I made sure they filled out their I-9 forms, and I took copies of their documents and made sure my files were complete and considered their applications because I was sure that INS would be into my office to go through my books and make sure that I followed the law because it was going to be enforced by this newly robust Federal Government. That was the commitment. Amnesty now, enforcement forever, never amnesty again.

That was 1986. And here we are all these years later, 24 years later, and we have had by each succeeding administration—I'm not particularly happy with the enforcement we saw in the Reagan administration, and I was less happy with the enforcement that I saw in Bush 41 and less happy with what I saw under Bill Clinton and less happy with what I saw under George W. Bush, and I'm less happy with what I've seen under President Obama. Less and less effective enforcement.

And they do find a way to put together the data so that they can point to their enforcement and allege that in this particular administration, the enforcement against employers appears to be marginally stronger than it was under George Bush, but the enforcement against illegal workers is significantly less than it was under George Bush, and I wasn't happy with what George Bush did.

So is the system broken? I think the enforcement of the system is broken, Madam Speaker. I think that we have had a succession of Presidents who didn't demonstrate the will to enforce our immigration law, and because of that, there has been a growing disrespect for our immigration law. And even people that respect the law have seen that their competition who would hire illegals have a comparative advantage against them if they are going to adhere to the intent of the law. So the competition pushes other employers to violate the intent and the rule of law sometimes and hire the illegals to give them that comparative advantage against their competition. And slowly the respect for the rule of law and their adherence and compliance with the law has been diminished in this country to the point where I have people in my neighborhood that will say, Well, if you don't think I should hire an illegal, then who is going to fix my leaky roof? Who's going to paint my house? Who's going to do these other things?

That's not my job, Madam Speaker. My job is to stand up for the rule of law. And, yes, if I think there are laws that are unjust, then I should join with my colleagues and we should find a way to change them.

I don't happen to believe that our immigration laws today are unjust. I believe they are unenforced. And I think they are founded on good and just rule of law foundation.

Not having the documents in front of me, but I will reach into it a little bit. I've seen some documents that illustrated the laws that Mexico has with regard to their immigration laws, which are if ours are considered Draconian, theirs, in fact, are Draconian. And President Calderon has been arguing against Arizona law while he is enforcing more Draconian laws in the nation of Mexico against people who would come into their southern border. Crossing the border illegally is a felony, punishable up to 2 years in the penitentiary. That's one of the examples that we have.